DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 165 UD 013 268

AUTHOR	Mondale, Walter F.
TITLE	Justice for Children.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity.
PUB DATE	Jun 72
NOTE	36p.; Committee print, Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($0.20)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; Bilingual Education; *Childhood Needs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Needs; Educational Opportunities; *Health Needs; Hospitals; Institutionalized (Persons); Mexican Americans; Political Issues; Racial Discrimination; Schools; Social Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS	*White House Conference on Children of 1970

ABSTRACT

On December 9, 1970, Senator Walter F. Mondale addressed the Senate on this nation's failure to meet the needs of its children and the need to implement the recommendations of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Speaking a week before the first meeting of the 1970 conference, he reviewed a series of preliminary forum reports which contain a number of constructive recommendations, as well as a trenchant, critical analysis of present programs and institutions affecting children. Among the issues overlooked by these reports is the insurance of the immediate implementation of the conference's recommendations. The delegates are urged to insist that a representative group from the conference be formed to call on the President personally while the conference is still in session, and seek his public support for implementation. They should get an agreement from this administration for immediate funding of an action committee, with an office in Washington and staff picked by this conference, to speak up for implementation of its findings; to get a Children's Advocacy Center created now, with money, before leaving town. They should let this be the first White House Conference ever to focus on creating a legislative strategy for implementing its findings. (Author/JM)

ED 072165

92d Congress
2d Session } COMMITTEE PRINT

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
UNITED STATES SENATE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JUNE 1972

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on
Equal Educational Opportunity

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
79-255 O WASHINGTON : 1972

UD 013268

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 20 cents

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., Virginia
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
EDWARD W. BROOKE, Massachusetts
MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky

WILLIAM C. SMITH, *Staff Director and General Counsel*

INTRODUCTION

On December 9, 1970, Senator Walter F. Mondale addressed the Senate on this Nation's failure to meet the needs of its children and the need to implement the recommendations of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Senator Mondale's statement, "Justice for Children," is reprinted here for the use of the committee.

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN

Next week a few thousand Americans, some famous, some just interested citizens—but all sharing a deep concern for their subject—will meet in Washington for the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Many of us are wondering just how helpful this conference is going to be.

Yesterday, the administrators of the conference released a series of preliminary forum reports which contain a number of constructive recommendations, as well as a trenchant, critical analysis of present programs and institutions affecting children.

I hope the delegates will also consider some of the issues overlooked by these reports, and above all, focus on the question of how to insure that immediate implementation of the conference's recommendations will follow. Certainly the past history of White House Conferences and President's Commissions is that they make strong, sweeping, perceptive reports which ultimately do nothing but gather dust. President Hoover's President's Conference 40 years ago produced a children's charter comprehensive enough and still unfulfilled enough to be a fine agenda for action today. Since I believe that charter would be of interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the record at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. President, there is recent experience, too. A reading of the panel reports which preceded last year's White House Conference on Nutrition reveals a clear and forceful agenda for action, including hundreds of constructive recommendations. That agenda was followed by promises of action. A year later these promises remained unfulfilled. The followup to that conference has been dismally weak.

So as the delegates prepare to come to Washington, I think it would be appropriate to convey some suggestions to them about what they might try to accomplish. I say to the delegates: Bear in mind the shelves of reports which already exist. Bear in mind what has happened in the past. Specifically, insist that a representative group from the conference be formed to call on the President personally while the conference is still in session and seek his public support for implementation. Abjure abstract discussion of new programs, new offices, new commissions, new agencies, new councils. Get an agreement from this administration, now, for immediate funding of an action committee, with an office here in Washington and staff picked by this conference, to speak up for implementation of its findings; get a Children's Advocacy Center created now, with money, before you leave town; let this be the first White House Conference ever to focus on creating a legislative strategy for implementing its findings.

This will do more to make the recommendations of this conference come to life than any other step. Take it from one who is personally

and painfully familiar with what happened after last year's White House Conference on Hunger. Do not leave town without establishing a concrete action mechanism.

I make a commitment to the delegates as well. Regardless of what the administration does—although I would prefer to work in cooperation with it—I will join with other Senators to introduce the constructive proposals of the conference in legislative form. And I will work to organize a bipartisan group of Members of the Congress to work on behalf of the children of America. If we can have Members of Congress for world peace through law, as we should and do, we can have Members of Congress for justice to children.

My advice to the delegates is not confined to the question of followup.

A study of the forum reports, as constructive as they are, reveals a certain lack of immediacy.

Nowhere in the reports do I find any real discussion of school desegregation. Yet this is an issue which has the gravest implications for the life chances of millions of American children—an issue where the direction of national policy is in heated debate every day, an issue where there is urgent need for public attention and response to the mounting evidence that the problems only begin for the black child when he is placed in a theoretically desegregated school. I find no mention of this in the forum reports. I hope the delegates will see that it is discussed.

And if there is little reference to school desegregation generally, there is no hint that this administration is at this moment spending millions of Federal dollars to support continued racist practices in schools in the name of aiding desegregation.

Reference to continued Federal inaction to solve the simplest and most inexcusable American problem—hunger—is confined to two paragraphs in one of the reports on health. I hope the delegates will raise that issue to a greater level of priority.

There are other omissions.

The forum reports are permeated with expressions of the need to protect children.But there is no attention to the fact that the President's Family Assistance Plan, pending in Congress right now, would force mothers of schoolage children to work even during hours when the children are not in school—a development which could hurt children further just as the conference seeks new ways to protect them.

The forum reports repeatedly stress the need for more child advocacy, but there is no mention that this administration has been moving in the other direction. The Community Action program, which created some local advocacy for children, is currently being emasculated and dismantled. The neighborhood Legal Services program, which created another effective means of advocacy for children, is in political difficulty within the administration. And there are elements in the administration who would curtail the activities of public interest law firms, still another source of effective advocacy for children.

The forum reports stress the need for expanded child welfare and child development programs, and do not mention that this is the first administration which sought a ceiling on funds for social services including day care. It is also the administration which opposed the expansion of Headstart, after its grand promises about the first 5 years of life.

So I urge the delegates to bring some immediacy to the deliberations of the Conference.

There is one further gaping omission in the forum reports—any consideration of basic power relationships in America. The reports rightly criticize the lack of accountability and the bureaucratic empire building in many programs for children. But their major recommendation to deal with these failures is advocacy, rather than greater participation in governance.

Advocacy is good, and the system of child advocacy proposed in the reports is both interesting and promising. But the fundamental question is power and powerlessness. The basic underlying reason, more important than any other, why millions of American children are victimized, is powerlessness—the lack of power which their parents and they have to affect the Government, the programs and the institutions which are supposed to serve them. Advocacy on behalf of the child to sue the system and otherwise demand that it operate properly will help. But what will help more is if parents and children—families—can participate in the decisions before they are made. What will help more is if the power is shared—if the composition and geographic reach of school boards are changed to be more reflective of the community; if the administration of welfare policy is changed so that recipients have a formal voice in making it; if the control of health policy decisions is changed so that the lay community has a direct voice in it.

Indeed, because the talk is more, far more, about what we are going to do better for and to children, than about increasing the share of power which they and their parents have, the net effect of the forum reports has a faint ring of the brave new world where the State knows what is best for everyone.

The suggestions in the reports, taken one by one, each have their merits. But taken with the realization that there is no extensive consideration of powerlessness and how to alleviate it, the total impression created by the reports is more than slightly paternalistic.

Of course the conference has not yet convened. My purpose is to urge the delegates to make this 1970 conference what many past conferences have not been—a continuing lever for real, fundamental social change in America in the immediate future.

For we are failing our children. Erik Erikson has said:

> The most deadly of all possible sins is the mutilation of a child's spirit.

This sin is being committed every day, all over America. Our national myth is that we love children. Yet, we are starving thousands. Other thousands die because decent medical care is unavailable to them. The lives of still other thousands are stifled by poor schools and some never have the chance to go to school at all. Millions live in substandard and unfit housing in neighborhoods which mangle the human spirit. Many suffer all of these mutilations simultaneously.

In every society some people are consigned to the scrap heap—the irretrievably handicapped, the incurably ill, the incorrigibly criminal, the hopelessly uneducable.

But, in America we have needlessly allowed the scrap heap to pile up and up.

The most obvious victims of course are the 10 million children living in poverty and the untold millions maimed by racism.

But the scrap heap is not outsized merely because of poverty and racism.

Have we reduced the victims of physical handicaps to the irreducible minimum? Not when 45 percent of the children born in U.S. hospitals do not receive the prenatal care which could prevent some of the handicaps in the first place. Not when there are 3.7 million handicapped children who are not receiving the special educational services they require.

Have we reduced the victims of mental illness to the irreducible minimum? Not when there are 1.3 million children who need mental health services but are not getting them.

Have we reduced the victims of mental retardation to the irreducible minimum? Not when there are 1 million educable mentally retarded children who will never get the help they need to reach their full potential.

The victims are most emphatically not just the poor and the minorities.

Consider the victims of bad health care. It is not surprising, perhaps that the infant mortality rate in Coahoma County, Miss., which is nearly two-thirds poor, is over twice the national average. But it may give pause to realize that the infant mortality rate in Westchester County, N.Y.—one of the wealthiest counties in America—is just about equal to the national average, a national average which is higher than at least a dozen other countries. No, the victims of bad health care are not just the poor.

Consider the victims of the tremendous shortage of preschool child development programs. Research shows that approximately 50 percent of a person's intellectual development takes place before he is 5 years old. Headstart and day care reach only one child in 10 among the poor, and the figures for children in other income groups are not much different. It is not just the poor who are missing out on crucial stimulation during the preschool years.

Consider the victims of our schools. The child of the ghetto may attend a school without textbooks, where the teacher thinks he is incapable of learning, where the paint peels and the plaster cracks, but the child of the suburbs finds less and less to engage him in school as well. Of 17 million schoolage children identified as "educationally deprived" by HEW, less than a third come from poverty families. "You have to have grown up in Scarsdale to know how bad things really are," one observer says. It is not just the poor who are the victims of our school systems.

Consider the victims of drug abuse. Millions of children—not just the poor—are having their lives twisted by the pandemic spread of drug abuse. Recent studies in suburban schools reveal that up to 75 percent of high school students have experimented with marihuana. Last year in Fairfax County, Va., there were more heroin cases discovered among young people than in the previous 5 years combined. The users come from among the highest income families in the county, including the sons and daughters of doctors and colonels. It is not just the poor who are the victims of drug abuse.

The children whom we are daily consigning to the scrap heap come from every income group, every racial group, every geographical area in our Nation. And every child consigned to the scrap heap is a useful life lost to the country, and indeed a lifetime of costs to the taxpayers in welfare, prison, or other expense.

The fact is that this is a problem in which the "real majority" has a deep and vital stake. It has become fashionable to suggest that the "real majority" somehow has concerns and views which are different from the poor. I disagree.

Fifty-five percent of Americans live in families with incomes of less than $10,000 a year. Whether the problem is schools or health care, or preschool programs, of what happens when a child is physically handicapped or mentally disturbed, all Americans share the same problems. And the sooner we can come to the shared realization that this is in fact the case, the sooner we shall create in America the atmosphere which our children need and deserve in which to grow up.

There is no one who perceives the gap between the need for change and the lack of will to act better than our children. Perhaps it is partly because they suffer its consequences most acutely, whether in the physical consequences of hunger and poor medical care, the psychic and intellectual consequences of bad schools, or the total consequences of being the drafted foot soldiers in a war they do not support.

We need no social scientists, no child psychologists or experts in human development, to tell us that a growing boy or girl, whatever his or her background, takes notice of the world, comes to see the way things work. Our American children, all of them, are every single day learning things about this Government and what it does or does not do. They are learning, wherever they live and whatever schools they attend, that the world's richest and strongest Nation seems powerless when it comes to cleaning up its air and its water; seems willing to let its countryside become cluttered and ravaged; seems compliant before the selfish demands of billboard advertisers who would assault our eyes; seems attuned to the ideas of airplane enthusiasts who do not care what all of our ears have to suffer, so long as a relative handful of people can go faster and faster in planes that require longer and longer runways, which take up more and more of our wealth, while all the time we must hear that there is a limit to what can be made available to medical scientists working on diseases like leukemia, diseases that strike at and kill thousands of children every year.

I know that talking of priorities goes on and on all over the country. But for all the talk, what chance is there that the year 1970, with its White House Conference on Children, will see any change in those priorities? Again, our children will be watching and taking note. They will see whether in the next months and years they can swim here or play there. They will see whether the schools they go to are halfway decent or not. They will, if taken ill, learn what kind of help they get, if any, from what kind of medical institutions. They will observe the way our land is preserved, or greedily and wantonly ruined. They will take note of the kind of fare they are offered on television programs. Their minds are no less capable than a grownup's of coming to the appropriate conclusions—of deciding whether or not this Nation

79-255 O - 72 - 2

is concerned with its future as well as its present, its long-term growth as well as its immediate appetites.

It is easy for us to deny children such vision and social intelligence; that way, we are let off the hook—and free to go about our business, paying lipservice to various humanitarian causes, while all the while ignoring the very real legislative and institutional backing those causes require. But the fact is, our children know what is going on. They have our number.

VICTIMS

Who are the victims of our neglect?

First. The migrant child. Nearly a million are children who live in families which subsist primarily by doing migrant or seasonal farmwork. There is no child in America more powerless to change his future, more powerless to escape the cycle of poverty into which he has been born.

In addition to the problems which confront every poor child, the migrant child suffers the consequence of constant rootlessness. The image of traveling together as a family is perhaps one of the most cherished of the American culture. But for the migrant child, travel only means a new shack, a new field to work in, and a new school, if any. Travel only increases the pace with which his life is destroyed. The very rootlessness of his life is a monstrous curse.

Born into extreme poverty—the average earnings of each farmworker from farm labor are less than $1,000 a year—the child not only is physically unable to attend school regularly, but he begins working at a very early age to supplement meager family earnings. He not only suffers from malnutrition, but his learning perspective is geared to a never ending cycle of backbreaking work—bending, lifting, and carrying. By the time he is 10 or 11 he has stopped going to school and is beginning to have to cope with life as an adult.

By the time he is 14 or 15 he is often married. Soon his health deteriorates—his teeth and skin begin to rot and his back shows the damaging effects of stoop labor. His ability to earn is permanently impaired. He is in constant debt, getting in deeper and deeper as life goes on. The grower and the crew leader advance him groceries and other necessities against his wages, and he never comes out ahead. He is powerless—both politically and economically—to affect his situation. The cycle is well on its way again.

Migrants are the poorest paid, the most underfed, the least healthy, the worst housed, the most undereducated, and perhaps the most abused human beings in our society today. What goes on from generation to generation is the awful wholesale destruction, physically and psychologically, of hundreds of thousands of American children—migrant children.

What is especially discouraging is that these remarks of mine are obviously not the first time, or the hundredth or the thousandth, that this tragedy has been brought to public attention. A half century of rhetoric—of books, poetry, song, presidential reports, congressional hearings, and television documentaries—has documented this modern-day slave system again and again.

To say that nothing has been done to help the migrant child would be unfair. A Migrant Health Act was passed about 10 years ago, which now provides a very limited $36 a year for the health of each migrant child, as opposed to the $96 which the average middle-income family spends annually on each of its children's health. The poverty program,

the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other Federal programs have titles or special provisions providing funds for migrant children, but these funds are very meager.

The most important hope for the migrant child of the future has been the rising of a great movement among the farmworkers—the movement to organize for the improvement of wages and working conditions through collective bargaining. After a half century of broken strikes and failed efforts, Cesar Chavez has molded a union which is surviving. But if Chavez has succeeded to some extent in California, there are still thousands of migrant children in Texas and Florida, and, indeed, New York and New Jersey and Michigan, for that matter, whose lives are essentially unchanged. There are still horrendous gaps in coverage by Federal labor law and social programs, including—of special significance to the migrant child—child labor laws.

The generational trap of poverty, the slave labor, the premature deterioration of health, the inevitable destruction of life—all these things remain essentially as they have perennially been for nearly a million migrant children in America.

"The Grapes of Wrath" was written almost 40 years ago, and John Steinbeck is dead, but the conditions continue.

If we are going to have White House Conferences on Children, let us put as much passion into the implementation as we do into the parlor discussion. Otherwise, 10 more years will pass. A few million more migrant children will go down the drain. And another conference will surely convene to talk about new directions for the future.

The black child in the rural South. Here we are on more familiar ground for the Nation. This child has been the subject of court suits, street demonstrations, and congressional debates which have commended national attention.

For those of us so disposed, we might congratulate ourselves just a bit. The black child in the rural South is not everywhere so trapped as he was a generation ago. Desegregation has produced broadened horizons for some, and more insistent demands for change from the current generation of young blacks in the South.

The Voting Rights Act has helped create an image of political possibility, resulting as it has in the election of 665 black officials in the Southern States and in the forced moderation of scores of white officials. Federal food programs reach some additional thousands of black children throughout the South, assuring that at least some children will not be irretrievably brain damaged in their infancy, and that others will be able to stay awake in school in order to learn. Headstart has helped open new worlds to thousands of children, and given their parents a stake in the improvement of the educational process.

But again, there is little reason for satisfaction, and even less for complacency. Regardless of what Mr. Moynihan and others say, the problems remain—educationally, politically, or economically.

Let the complacent one visit the black communities of Bolivar County, Miss.; Lowndes County, Ala.; Dorchester County, S.C.; or Terrell County, Ga. Or let him, for that matter, visit the Harlems and the Houghs, the Anacostias and the Roxburys, where thousands of blacks thought they would find the promised land after fleeing the depredations of plantation life.

It was Michael Harrington who told us 10 years ago, in revealing "The Other America" to his fellow citizens, that while we had a poverty problem in this country, it did not exist on a scale or in an intensity comparable to other nations. We learned during the 1960s that he was wrong. We found that there were families in Mississippi and elsewhere who literally had no cash income. We saw, because a few Senators and some media people care, that there are children in America who have bloated bellies and running sores that will not heal.

There still are. It is not so fashionable in 1970 to talk about them. Hunger, it seems, was last year's issue. The other day someone remembered that President Nixon promised a free school lunch for every poor child by this Thanksgiving. It has not happened. Urgently needed reforms in the food stamp program have been in controversy for more than three and a half years and have still not been enacted. And all the while, there are still bloated bellies in Mississippi. I know it is hard to remember that every day. It is an uncomfortable thought, but in these days of our senses being assaulted with so many outrages, we have acquired an incapacity for further shock. That is too bad. Andrew Jackson's children in Winstonville, Miss., do not find it so easy to forget.

Nor are the problems of the black child growing up in the South just the same old ones—hunger, bad housing, no medical care, substandard jobs or no jobs at all, although these problems are all still with us.

Our achievements have produced new problems. Segregated classrooms are replacing segregated schools. Many black school principals are now in white schools in demoted positions. Thousands of black teachers have lost their jobs. The black child has been brought across town to the white school, but his athletic trophies have been left behind, and often he or she cannot play in the band or be a cheerleader or run for homecoming queen. Violence and intimidation are still problems—Lamar, S.C., was nationally publicized, but fear still stalks the dark back roads of hundreds of communities.

These things have not happened everywhere, of course. But they have happened in a shocking number of places. And the present administration has not only shut its eyes to these events but has even rewarded hundreds of offending school districts throughout the South. The $75 million appropriated under the emergency school assistance program has cheerfully and unashamedly been distributed to districts which are in clear violation of Federal civil rights laws, and for such racist purposes as improving the hygiene of black children so they do not contaminate the white children whom they may now chance to encounter in the hall between classes.

We have begun to tear down the outward manifestations of legal segregation. But we have not achieved real desegregation or quality education on the basis of a relationship of equality and respect. That is the challenge of the seventies. It has taken us 16 years to dismantle rural southern dual school systems. I am not sure we have 16 years to build a new structure. Black children are not nearly so patient as they once were.

In all of this, fortunately, there is some hope for further change, even accelerated change. This hope comes not from any new outpouring of conscience or commitment in white America, but from the very

79-255 O - 72 - 3

fact that the black community itself in the South, as well as elsewhere in the Nation, has achieved a new level of awareness and organization. Beginning with the civil rights movement, and undoubtedly assisted by Federal legislation, a new generation of black leadership has arisen which, like Cesar Chavez among the migrants, will insist on change. This is the best hope we have for the future.

If the White House Conference on Children were more possessed of a sense of urgency, it would have a forum taking a very hard and tough look at the results of school desegregation and where we go now, and another examining the continued ravages of hunger and malnutrition. Thousands of black children have undoubtedly escaped from the trap in recent years, but make no mistake about it—there are millions of more black children in the South who, as things are now, will find it impossible to get out of the complex trap of powerlessness and poverty and racism.

The Indian child. Perhaps the greatest poverty in America exists among American Indians. Add to this the welfare dependency and hopelessness which generations of paternalistic Federal trusteeship have brought, and the trap which confronts the Indian child is at least as dangerous and powerful as that which ensnares the migrant child.

We have heard it before, but we forget that annual Indian per capita income is only $1,500, less than half of the national average, that infant mortality is almost twice the national average, that 90 percent of Indian housing is substandard, and that suicide rates on the typical Indian reservation are more than double the national average.

As in other areas, the situation is not quite as bad as it was 10 years ago. The major reason is a rising generation of Indian young people of greater awareness and competency, who are not only committed to improving life in their communities, but are acquiring some of the skill and political sophistication that is necessary to bring change.

But the American Indian is still governed by a Congress which too often is more interested in protecting the land and water interests of the white man than in making a better life for the Indian. And power relationships at the local level are still not significantly different.

Three out of five Indian children attend local public schools—schools which are funded by Federal funds under the Johnson-O'Malley Act and the impacted school areas legislation. But this money is often spent for purposes which do not benefit Indian children, and the Indian child is more often than not assumed by the school system to be slow, lazy or dumb. Indian students on the Muckleshoot reservation in Washington are automatically retained an extra year in the first grade of their public schools, and the Nook-Sack Indians of western Washington are automatically placed in a class of slow learners without achievement testing. No wonder massive early dropouts from school occur, and high rates of suicide and alcoholism ensue.

A third of the Indian children are in schools run by the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs. Some of these are in boarding schools, including some 7,000 Navajo children under the age of 9, some of whom have frozen to death trying to escape and get home during the winter. About 1,200 Alaskan natives presently go to Federal boarding schools in Oregon and Oklahoma, thousands of miles from home. Two-thirds of the Indian children entering BIA schools have little or no skill in English, but less than 5 percent of the teachers in BIA schools are

native to the culture and the language of the children they teach. Only 773 Indian children in the entire country were reached by the Federal bilingual education program in a recent year.

It has been our national assumption that Indians do not know how to do anything for themselves. Reservations are in general managed by white employees of the BIA, and Indian young people everywhere are indoctrinated with the idea of their incompetency.

The Indian child is also victimized by one of America's most dangerous and mean assumptions—that there is only one language in America, and that others are not worth while and will not be countenanced. Courses on Indian heritage and culture are nonexistent in both Federal and local public schools, and children are in every way made to feel that their own heritage and culture is inferior and worthless.

The rising young Indian leadership now beginning to develop gives some hope for change. But here, as with black children and others who are different, the Nation needs to learn a simple but profound lesson: If this country is to become what we have long claimed it to be, every citizen needs a full and free set of options for his life. It should be possible for the American Indian to live a life of fulfillment within his traditional family and tribal structure on the reservation, if he chooses to, but it should also be possible for the Indian child to go to the city and join the mainstream of American life if that is his wish. The assumption was made less than a generation ago that all Indians would be better off if forced away from the reservation. We have at least learned that that was wrong. Now we must make the choice of life-styles more than a choice between two lives of enforced deprivation—not paternalistically, not because we are generous, but out of a realization that there should be in America the capacity to celebrate diversity and to find new strength for our country in that fact.

I come back again, as I think about the White House Conference, to the matter of urgency. The forum reports make the salutary suggestion that control of Johnson-O'Malley and impacted area funds be turned over to local Indian communities. But I do not see enough of the sense that every day of delay in reforming the educational process for the Indian child is a day in which more suicides will occur and more alcoholics will be created.

The Chicano child and the Puerto Rican child. The list of victims proliferates. There are nearly 10 million Americans whose first language is Spanish, and whose heritage is a Spanish-language culture. There are many who have Portuguese, Chinese, French, Japanese, and other culture and language heritages. Like the Indian child, the Chicano or Puerto Rican child or other linguistically and culturally different child is daily penalized by the forced application of homogeneity, the assumption that diversity is intolerable.

Until recent years the Chicano—or Mexican American, as the Anglo culture dominated him—was a forgotten minority of huge proportions. Politicians sought his vote, but after the election things went back to business as usual. Nationally, he was eclipsed by the greater numbers and earlier political awareness of the black community. He was thought to be submissive and unquestioning of authority. His child was among the more invisible of our victims.

Now we know a little more about how things are. We have had some national attention to the Chicano as a farmworker, through the organizing efforts of Cesar Chavez with the help of the media. The growing Puerto Rican minority in New York City and elsewhere has begun to surface. The barrio of East Los Angeles has erupted in violence. A network television documentary has shown a newly born Chicano child dying of prenatal starvation within a stone's throw of the multimillion-dollar Hemis-Fair entertainment complex in San Antonio.

The Nation has begun to hear some tales from the victims who survived. We now know that 50 to 90 percent of Chicano and Puerto Rican children, depending on the area, come to school speaking only Spanish. Many of them, we find, are put in classes for the mentally retarded simply because they cannot cope with standaridized English-language intelligence tests.

The Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity which I chair has heard some extraordinary personal testimony: A near Ph. D. Puerto Rican in educational administration at Harvard who was classified as retarded in elementary school; a Chicano Ph. D. in clinical psychology who spent several years in mentally retarded classes as a child; and a Puerto Rican woman lawyer who was told she had an IQ of 20 in elementary school. These are among the handful of victims who survived.

Others are not so fortunate. As many as one out of five Chicano children never go to school. Of those who do, one out of four drop out by the eighth grade. Less than half graduate from high school. In one school district in California 99 percent of the children in kindergarten are Chicano but only 30 percent of the graduating seniors are Chicano. Of 7,000 school-age Puerto Rican children in Boston, seven graduated from high school this past June.

Why? Not only are intelligent children treated as uneducable, but Spanish-speaking children are often forbidden to speak their native language in school and in many cases are even punished for doing so. In a south Texas school, children are forced to kneel on the playground and beg forgiveness if they are caught talking to each other in Spanish. In an Arizona elementary school, children who answer a question in Spanish are required to come up to the teacher's desk and drop pennies in a bowl—one penny for each Spanish word spoken. "It works," the teacher boasts. "They come from poor families, you know."

Of course, the ways in which the Chicano and Puerto Rican children are victimized go on and on—the poor health care, the poor housing, the lack of job opportunities, and there is again the all-pervasive powerlessness. When Cesar Chavez began to organize, he found the law enforcement officials of the communities in California where he was working squarely on the side of the growers. When Chicano high school students in a small town in Texas demonstrated against school conditions, some were beaten by Texas Rangers, and those who were old enough were reclassified 1–A by the local selective service board. The sense of hopelessness, of inability to change conditions, is a major barrier to change. But again, if there is any basis for hope, it comes not alone from any increased commitment among Anglo politicians, but also from a rising generation of dedicated and able Chicano and

Puerto Rican leaders. In Texas the Mexican-American Youth Organization, denounced as "militant" a year ago, helped form a new political party and elected a member to the school board in Crystal City. In New York, Herman Badillo has been elected to Congress. All over the country Chicano and Puerto Rican young people are on the move, sometimes with tactics which cooler heads deem unacceptable or unwise, but always with a commitment and perseverance which are profoundly admirable.

As with Indian children, if the White House Conference were to be fully relevant, one would have expected to find more extended and specific reference to the daily damage we are doing to the children of Spanish-speaking Americans.

The poor white child. Two-thirds of the poor children in America are white. This is a fact which should have great political implications, but it is too often ignored or forgotten.

The greatest concentration of white poverty is, of course, in Appalachia. Things have not changed very much since the days when John Kennedy campaigned in West Virginia and was so deeply moved by what he saw there. In Appalachia today more than three-quarters of a million young people sit in the hollows and hills facing lifelong unemployment if they remain at home, and lacking the skills to do much of consequence if they leave. Over 900,000 children under 6—nearly half of the preschool children in the region—are poor. Less than one of 20 of Appalachia's poor children is in Headstart. Only 6 percent of Appalachia's children receive welfare assistance.

The way things work is quite simple, though perhaps the truth is a bit hard to face. The outside economic interests which control the region no longer have any need for the labor of the men who live there. Coal mining is gone or largely automated. Children are neglected because social services are not thought to be important for people of no economic value. There are no jobs for the fathers, either privately or governmentally created. There is no welfare if the man is living at home with his family. And the schools for the children are badly underfunded. Local authorities remain unwilling or unable to tax the outside large corporations. So the school construction needs of the 13 Appalachian States represented 42 percent of the total school construction needs in the entire country in a recent year.

The power structure would just as soon that the former coal miners and former dirt farmers leave the region.

This approach ignores two problems: First, some people who live in a place call it home. They want to live there. They do not accept the idea that someone wants to force them to move elsewhere. Second, it is hard to go elsewhere when one lacks the skills to do much once one is there.

Thus, again, the trap. And as surely as the black child is still oppressed by the white power structure in the South, the white child of Appalachia is also oppressed by the white power structure. Racism in America is not all racial.

If the White House Conference had a deeper sense of immediacy, the children of Appalachia and the economic interests which oppress them would be the subject for a forum in themselves.

Some of the victims whom I have mentioned live in cities. But any child who lives in one of the large central cities of America is a victim in ways which transcend his race and even his economic status.

The air he breathes—polluted by automobiles, powerplants, industrial plants, and home heating—makes him far more subject to disease than his suburban or rural counterpart.

The congestion in which he lives has clinically observable effects on his mental state. It is not surprising, for example, that studies find an astonishing incidence of mental illness in New York City, where the population density is almost 1,000 times that of the country generally, and an even greater incidence in central Harlem, where density is near 10,000 times the national average.

But that is only the beginning. In most instances, the urban child must face and deal with the worst aspects of America's institutions. The child attending school in one of the 20 largest school systems in the country is almost a year behind the national norm for the rest of the country. The health problems faced by the urban child are equally as horrifying.

Venereal disease has gone beyond the epidemic stage. Infant mortality in the ghettos and barrios is often four times the national average. And drug addiction is now rampant in all parts of every major city. For a child of the city, his powerlessness and isolation from the mainstream of America are more obvious at an early age; his disconnection from society's major institutions, schools, police, religious institutions, business and industry is more blatant. Lack of space, poor housing, density, and inadequate opportunities strain family relationships even further.

Every institution which confronts the urban child is the biggest, most unresponsive form of that institution our country has to offer.

The schools are dropout factories. In the ghetto schools, children as they get older fall further and further behind national norms in every skill.

The city hospital is totally dehumanizing. The patient waits 2 to 4 hours in a clinic to see a doctor he has never seen before and is likely never to see again.

The welfare is at its most bureaucratic and degrading. The landlord is an absentee or a public housing authority as bureaucratic as the slumlord is neglectful. The credit merchant overreaches, and repossesses the moment payments fall behind.

We are coming to the point in America where the sheer fact of urban life, and particularly ghetto life, is a process of victimization in itself. People laughed nervously a couple of years ago when Jules Feiffer wrote a play called "Little Murders" in which urban life disintegrated into a sniper war. The play is no longer funny. It is coming true.

Our response so far is repression. Arresting the perpetrators of violence is right, as far as it goes. But if that is all we do, if we do not

seek the causes and try to eliminate them, we are asking for a generation of urban guerrilla warfare.

The danger is not that there will be a successful revolution. We have in this technological society all the forces and power and weapons necessary for effective repression. The only catch is that we will have a different sort of country when we are through. A better course would be to stop now, reexamine national priorities, and commit the resources necessary to bring about the climate of justice and equality of opportunity within which guerrilla warfare will not arise and flourish. I do not see that question on the agenda of the White House Conference.

The handicapped child. There are more than 7 million handicapped children in America—emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, physically handicapped in one of the variety of ways, or suffering from special learning difficulties. Nearly 5 million of these children are receiving no special educational services or other help.

Some are poor, but most are not. Most are children whose problem is not irremediable enough to cause them to be discarded into a public residential institution, but for whom the public schools have no appropriate programs and private services are either unavailable or too expensive.

We have, plainly and simply, failed these children. They are the victims of our neglect.

Consider the child who is in a residential institution either for the mentally retarded or the mentally ill. Typically, it is old, crowded, understaffed, filthy, sterile, strewn with feces, devoid of hope, filled with blank faces. There are retarded children there who are educable if the special education services are available. There are disturbed children who are curable if the psychiatric services were available. There are neglected and abandoned children who are there simply because there is no other place to put them, and who will remain there until they are 16 and then be dumped on the street, propelled to the scrap heap by a society which did not care enough to make life possible for them.

Here again, our treatment is both inhumane and senseless. It would save money to save lives. The annual cost of foster care is about one-eighth the cost of institutionalization. The lifetime cost of educating an educable handicapped or retarded child is about $20,000. Institutionalizing him will cost well over $200,000. And the Nation's handicapped children have potential earning power of $15 billion if they receive the special education and services necessary for them to realize their personal and economic potential.

We are not going in that direction. In a recent year the Federal Government appropriated over $1 billion for cotton price support and one-twentieth that amount for child mental health services conceived in the broadest possible terms.

The 1930 White House Conference said:

> The emotionally disturbed child has a right to grow up in a world which does not set him apart, which looks at him not with scorn or pity or ridicule—but which welcomes him exactly as it welcomes every child, which offers him identical privileges and identical responsibilities.

Where are we now?

The child and the law. The child's life—rich or poor—can become entwined with the State in a variety of ways. He may be a neglected or abandoned child. He may be born out of wedlock or be the victim of a divorce where his future is determined without any legal protection for him. He may be deemed incorrigible by his parents or his teacher, or alleged to be a law violator of some kind.

The paradox of our national behavior is that we do both too much and too little. Too many children are swept off the streets for one reason or another. In various States, a child can end up in court and then reform school or training school for such dangerous behavior as violating a curfew, hanging around a poolroom, wandering around a railroad track, swearing in public, sleeping in an alley, drinking, or smoking in public. He can be taken away from his parents, with or without their consent.

Once in the hands of the State, he is not at all certain of being any better off. Milton Luger, a nationally known expert on juvenile delinquency, has made the following extraordinary statement:

> It would be better for all concerned if young delinquents were not detected, apprehended, or institutionalized. Too many of them get worse in our care.

First, the child gets a juvenile or family court hearing which is likely to be as short as 10 or 15 minutes in length. Before that hearing ever occurs he may be kept in a juvenile detention facility, perhaps in solitary confinement, for weeks on end or, even worse, his "pretrial" detention may have been in a county jail where he is mixed with adult prisoners, subject to homosexual abuse and the influence of hardened criminals. Adults are constitutionally entitled to bail under these circumstances. Children are not.

His court hearing may well be conducted without any legal representation, despite the Supereme Court's 1967 *Gault* decision requiring otherwise.

Having engaged in behavior which would not be a crime if he were an adult, he may nonetheless be adjudged a delinquent and sent away. Worse still, a judge not wanting to stigmatize him as a delinquent may send him away, noting on his record that he awaits "further orders of the court." This may be enough to keep him locked up a year or two, or even more.

The institution to which he is sent is seldom more than a crime factory. Educational programs are weak, psychological counseling infrequent or nonexistent, guards are frequently brutal, conditions are overcrowded, and stimulating activities scarce. Children with widely divergent problems are mixed together. Some are retarded. Some are disturbed. Too often, no sorting process exists.

As Howard James says in the subtitle of his shocking recent book, "Children in Trouble," the situation is a national scandal.

Less than a year ago, the New York Times reported the death of a 12-year-old heroin addict in Harlem—Walter Vandermeer .Charlayne Hunter and Joseph Lelyveld of the Times reconstructed his life. Public school gave up on him in the third grade, without trying to get him any psychological counseling from the school system's bureau of child guidance. Instead, it referred his case to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children which brought him to family court on a neglect

petition. He was put in a children's shelter run by the society, and shortly moved to another public children's shelter. Shortly thereafter, the court released him, but he was back within 6 months, and was assigned first to a halfway house in Harlem and then to the Wiltwyck School in uptstate New York—the fifth institutional setting in which he had been locked in 15 months. Wiltwyck gave up on him in 6 months and sent him back to family court, which let him back on the street again. The court, though finding him too disturbed for Wiltwyck, found, for reasons known only to itself, that he was not disturbed enough to be sent to a State training school. A year later he was dead. Most appalling, one school official told reporters that Walter's case was mishandled so badly, not because of incompetency, but because of overwhelming numbers. As he put it, "There are thousands of Walter Vandermeers out there."

Walter Vandermeer was a spectacular kind of victim. But the fact is there are 100,000 children in America in correctional-type institutions on any given day; the courts handle a million nontraffic juvenile cases a year—the children who drift in and out of the world of courts, social agencies, and special schools; and there are still thousands more out on the street where Walter Vandermeer eventually died, who have no hope at all of getting any help. The paradox is that no matter what happens as things are, no matter whether the neglected or disturbed or difficult child gets involved with the State or stays on the street—either way, he is a victim.

Institutions. I have listed a number of kinds of victims. Some are poor and some are racial minorities. Some are children with special problems. But they are not alone.

The fact is, all of our children are victims. The neglect, the mutilation affect the vast majority of our children—in certain respects all of them. Middle-class as well as poor children watch television commercials that are vulgar, insulting, misleading and frivolous, and television programs saturated with mindless violence, historical distortions, or rudely condescending remarks—programs which in sum treat American citizens as if they are infinitely exploitable. All children live and play and grow up in world whose air is thick with smoke and dust and dirt, thick with obnoxious, foul-smelling, irritating substances whose potential hurtfulness we are only beginning to look and study and estimate. Any child, rich or poor, can fall sick and find out that, yes, progress is being made on this or that disease—but only some progress, because we have set limits on how many doctors we turn out, and the money we need for various kinds of medical research is building huge, outmoded technological equipment.

What the list of victims does not adequately underscore is that the institutions and programs and structures which were created when things were simpler are simply not working now.

Education. Some of the questions about our schools are monetary; and I mean not only our ghetto schools or the schools on our Indian reservations or up our Appalachian hollows, but the schools most American children attend, the schools in Sacramento, Calif., and Boston, Mass., and in the cities and towns of the Midwest and the Prairie States, as well as the South. Do those schools have the books and other materials they need, the equipment they need? Are those schools new enough and pleasant to be in, and well heated and airy, and spacious and pro-

vided with good lighting? Do those schools have the services of school nurses and school doctors? Do they have adequate cafeterias and adequate playgrounds and adequate laboratories? Are the buses that bring those children to school safe? For that matter, are the school buildings themselves safe—and as well, not overcrowded, not understaffed, not old and dingy and depressing, a constant sign to children of what their Nation is and is not willing to do for its children?

Have we taken pains to document how many American workingmen have children at school in buildings labeled even by school authorities "inadequate" or "temporary structure"? Have we tried to find out what kind of educational services children get—not on paper, but in fact—if they are retarded or handicapped or plagued by one or another psychological problem that affects their ability to concentrate and learn? Have we gathered information, city by city, State by State, region by region, as to what deaf children, blind children, brain-injured children, children with speech-learning difficulties, gifted children, get in the way of the special teaching they need? Have we studied our schools of education, which supply us with teachers—obtained from them a comprehensive estimate, national in its scope, of their needs? How many men and women who already are teachers become understandably tired and weary, and frustrated and bitter—as they are asked to do their work under discouraging—if not impossible—circumstances and for wages that are an insult to them as citizens of this Nation? And finally, what does it all mean to our children—that teachers are treated as they are, that so many school buildings and classrooms are left as they are rather than torn down and replaced by what is minimally acceptable, let alone optimally desirable?

But money is far from the only problem. The more basic question is what goes on in the schools, how the money they do get is spent. Listen to the remarks of a student evaluator of the very affluent Montgomery County school system in suburban Maryland just outside of Washington:

> From what we know to be true, as fulltime students and researchers of the County School System (as well as from every attempt we know of to survey student attitudes in the county), it is quite safe to say that the public schools have critically negative and absolutely destructive effects on human beings and their curiosity, natural desire to learn, confidence as individuals, creative freedom of thought and self respect.

Listen to the words of another Montgomery County student:

> Fear—the school system is based upon fear. Students are taught from the outset that they should be afraid of having certain things happen to them: Bad grades, punishment from authorities, humiliation, ostracism, "failure," antagonizing teachers and administrators—are all things that terrify students as they enter first grade. These fears, which school officials use as a lever from elementary school through high school to establish and maintain order and obedience, have horribly destructive effects: They may be reflected in extreme nervousness, terror, paranoia, resentment, withdrawal, alienation; they may be visible, they may be submerged, but in either case these effects should be of utmost concern to those who value the human mind and spirit.

Montgomery County is one of the most respected, most affluent school systems in America. It stands to reason that these observations are not unique. Student dissatisfaction is widespread throughout the country. Eighty-five percent of the schools responding to a Syracuse University questionnaire this year said they had had some type of disruption within the last 3 years. Fifty-nine percent of the high schools and 56 percent of the junior high schools studied by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1969 experienced some form of protest.

Obviously there is a mixture of failures. There is a failure to impart basic skills—one out of four students in the public schools of New York State cannot pass even minimal tests of competency in reading and mathematics.

But the failure goes far deeper. What the students in Montgomery County are talking about, and what many protesters in other affluent systems throughout the country are rebelling against, is an attitude which places conformity above individuality, discipline above creativity, which above all conducts education as though the concept of an educated person were a constant, the same in 1970 as, say, in 1950. Young people mature earlier than they have at any time in our history, or at any time in recent history—since young people assumed adult responsibilities in pioneer days far earlier than they do now. They have serious questions about the way our Government and our society operate. These questions are not answered by courses which teach that America has never been the aggressor or never lost a war.

Partly the attitude is the attitude of the parents and the adult generation generally. Two-thirds of a group of high school parents surveyed in 1969 said that they believe "maintaining discipline is more important than student self-inquiry." To be young is to be by definition untrustworthy. In one New York suburb a new middle school has been badly needed for years. The school board repeatedly refused to approve its construction until recently when the superintendent explained publicly that the new school was essential in order to remove the 10 to 13 year olds from the bad influence of the high school kids with their drugs, their "experimentation," and their "radical politics." It is no wonder that recent years have seen books with titles like "Death at an Early Age," "Our Children Are Dying," and "Crisis in the Classroom."

There is no doubt of it—our schools are failing millions of our children.

Corporations. The question of the social responsibility of the corporation is, of course, far broader than its responsibility to the child, but a few examples will illustrate how the child is particularly victimized by corporate irresponsibility or plain failure to take the child's interests into account.

A committee of the American Academy of Pediatrics recently concluded that air pollution is more dangerous to children in some respects than it is to adults, in terms of greater susceptibility to respiratory infections, which can lead in turn to permanent lung damage. What corporate consideration is given to children when it is decided that an industrial plant will use one type of fuel rather than another, or one grade of oil rather than another, thereby polluting the air more rather than less? What type of consideration is given to children when the automobile industry mindlessly pours more exhaust-spewing

cars onto urban roads sending air pollution counters off their dials? What kind of consideration are children given when a large public utility decides to build another fossil fuel power-generating plant in the middle of a large city, thereby polluting the air further? Perhaps if children were kept explicitly in mind when these decisions are being made, urban life generally would be less oppressive and less dangerous.

The food industry is another example. Here the responsibility is more direct.

What kind of food do we think we are buying for our children, and what do we actually get? How are we to make sense of some of the things we read on packages of food destined to be put before our children?

Every mother who has warmed a jar of baby food has tested the temperature with her finger—which she usually licks. Baby food companies know that and they flavor and salt the baby food to suit the mother's tastes. Lost in this consideration is the fact that babies need less salt than others, and children who are taught to crave salt risk hypertension in old age.

There are other problems. The family accustomed to eating large quantities of rice was better nourished before the advent of polished rice. The mother who buys concentrated fruit juice to give her family vitamins and citric acid really gives her family flavored water if the concentrate was sold in a cardboard container. Cardboard, unlike the old tin cans, is porous and air produces a chemical reaction which can weaken or eliminate the vitamin content of the drink.

During World War II we had State laws requiring that commercial bread be made with fortified flour but they have been allowed to fall into disuse. Commercial bread—despite sweeping advances in food fortification—no longer contains fully fortified flour. Consider how much bread our children eat.

Anemia is a public health problem. It is widespread. It is particularly common in teenage girls, pregnant women, and young children. It has, depending upon the severity, a variety of debilitating effects. It could easily be eliminated. Iron fortification is a relatively simple process which is known not to affect food composition and consistency in most cases, and could be introduced with sufficient control to virtually wipe out anemia. That alone would eliminate nutritional anemia in pregnancy and improve the chances for normalcy for many of our children.

What people need, rich and poor, is nutritious food. If teenagers want to eat french fries and hamburgers, then we should use enriched flour in the hamburger bun and enrich the soft drinks that go with it. If a family wants to eat pasta, then we should make available the nutritious, enriched macaronis already developed.

Then there is the responsibility of television as a corporate entity. Study after study has shown the deleterious effects of violence on television, but it still saturates the airwaves. "Sesame Street" is widely heralded, but it, or anything like it, is seldom seen on commercial television. And television is still saturated as well with commercials which calculatingly and often misleadingly play on the emotions and desires of chidren. Saturday morning children's television has 50 percent more commercial messages than adult television. If a child watches children's television half the time it is on, and pays attention to only

a half again of the blandishments of Tony the Tiger, Cap'n Crunch, and Fred Flintstone for various edibles, he gets twice as many messages from them as from his mother who tells him every day at breakfast to eat nutritious food.

Finally, toy manufacturers have a tremendous responsibility to the health and well-being of American children. When an arm of a toy doll is pulled off leaving a sharp prong uncovered, when the eye on a baby's toy can be detached and swallowed, when an electric toy reaches heat that can burn, when games are covered with glass that shatters on impact, or when sharply pointed, heavily weighted darts are sold—children's lives are threatened.

Toys like these may be profitable, but they injure 700,000 children a year. Almost one out of five eye injuries to children involves a toy.

The children of America have a right to better protection from both the corporations that manufacture toys and the Government agencies that are responsible for making sure these toys are safe. That right is being ignored. Despite authority to ban new toys found hazardous to children, HEW acted in only three cases, and only after the Secretary was sued by the Consumers Union. And HEW still refuses to ban further sales of a heavily weighted, sharply pointed lawn dart that has already killed two children and wounded 14 others. Every American child and every American parent has a right to expect more.

Health care for children. I have already alluded to the failure of performance in child health care as measured by a classic indication like infant mortality. There are a million children born every year without adequate prenatal care, and 21 million children who see a physician less often than once a year.

Look at it from the doctor's side—there are only 12,000 pediatricians in the United States, about a third of what we need. Or from the money side—only 10 percent of the Federal health research dollar is spent on children.

Look at it from the family's point of view—how hard it is to get a doctor to make a house call, how long the wait is in the doctor's office, let alone the public clinic or emergency room.

Of course there is the financial side of it—only 10 percent of child health care is covered by health insurance.

It is not easy to talk about such matters. It is not easy to remind factory workers and white-collar workers and small businessmen that a sudden medical emergency which afflicts one of their children is an emergency which also can all too quickly be a financial disaster. It is not easy to remind those same working people, hard-working people, that no matter how long and earnestly they work, at no matter how many jobs, their children might one day suffer because we as a Nation haven't supported the medical research we might, haven't trained the doctors we might, have not built the hospitals we might—or equipped them as we might.

Let us try to relate this situation to the typical American workingman—the so-called middle American. Even before his child is born there are risks and dangers that are avoidable, yet permitted by us in America. I refer to the illnesses pregnant women can get—illnesses that cost mony only the rich can put their hands on, illnesses that require medical care and medical equipment simply not available in many cities and towns and whole counties and entire States of these

United States. Likewise at birth or after birth, the child as well as his or her mother can require prolonged and delicate attention from skilled physicians and those who work alongside them—all of whom are in short supply in many parts of this country. What is a workingman to do? He cannot rent planes and fly his family halfway across the country and check into a hotel and stay there while his wife and child are treated. Nor can he pay the thousands and thousands of dollars that hospitals and doctors and "services" cost. His child may have some bone trouble, a particularly difficult club foot, cerebral palsy, a congenital heart defect or another "problem" that we lump together under categorical, descriptive terms like "congenital disorder" or "mental retardation" or "physically handicapped." He may live in a large- or medium-sized city, let alone in rural areas—and be told there is a waiting list for this, there are no facilities for that, and so it goes and so it has to be. Our Government takes a census every 10 years, and is always coming up with facts or figures about the economy, the war, the state of our defenses.

I wonder why we do not try to find out and report upon how many children are born with or succumb to severe and crippling illnesses, injuries to their bodies and brains, diseases that affect their growth and development—and then go on to get thoroughly inadequate treatment for such afflictions. Perhaps if we knew how many children need pediatricians, need surgeons, need physical therapists, need child psychiatrists, need one or another kind of machine or instrument or mode of therapy—and do not get what they need—then we would be in a position to weigh our priorities, so that when generals and admirals, already in control of enough military hardware to destroy the entire planet, tell us they have needs, they want another kind of plane or ship or gun, we can say to them yes, we want to protect this country, and protect it not only from outside enemies but from diseases that every single day unnecessarily kill and maim and stunt, and cause pain and suffering to American children.

The whole system is a nonsystem.

The hospital is the costliest way to dispense medical care, and it has become nearly 100 percent more costly in just the last 5 years. Yet, we still continue to put children in hospitals who do not have to be there, who could be taken care of in a doctor's office or a neighborhood clinical setting. Blue Cross and other hospital insurances still require that children be put in hospitals if they are to be reimbursed for procedures which could be performed outside the hospital. The Government reimburses hospitals under medicare and medicaid without asking any greater efficiency in return. In short, no leverage whatsoever is exercised to require the development of a system of neighborhood clinics which could dispense preventive care and keep children out of hospitals instead of forcing them in.

The same situation exists regarding medical manpower. There are dozens of tasks which could be performed by physicians' assistants and other paraprofessional manpower. The doctor is the costliest form of medical manpower. The cost of care and the scarcity of personnel could be greatly alleviated if we were to change the mix of medical manpower. It has not happened.

These faults of organization have caused medical costs to skyrocket. The situation is intolerable. Not only is medical care less

available than it should be, but it is too often provided in the least efficient possible way, and it is too often financially out of the reach of the typical family.

As a consequence, millions of our children are victims.

The welfare system. Here we have another nonsystem which has grown up over the years—which destroys children, breaks up families, perpetuates dependency, robs people of dignity, and leaves them in poverty—and infuriates giver and recipient alike.

The visible, highly debated problem is, of course, financial assistance to poor children.

But we do a poor job with other welfare problems as well—notably adoption and foster care. Adoption is limited in many places by outmoded laws restricting racial and religious mixing of children and parents, and by the fact that adoption policies are controlled by traditional private welfare agencies whose good intentions are matched only by their "welfarist" orientation.

Foster care is limited by lack of funds as well as by traditionalist attitudes, like the idea that a single person cannot be an adopting or foster parent. There are perhaps three times as many children in need of foster care as actually get it.

Lost, too, in the debate over the administration's family assistance plan is its unprecedented proposal to limit funds for social services including day care to 110 percent of last year's appropriation—a dangerous precedent indeed in an area where we have at least had the advantage of open-ended appropriation.

And the FAP itself is bad for children. For who is more the victim of the President's "work force" than the child whose mother is forced to work?

FAP is perplexing to those of us who want to support real welfare reform. In return for a national minimum floor for benefits and for extending aid to the working poor—both highly desirable reforms—we are being asked to accept a new system which will force mothers to work, with consequent risk to their children.

Secretary Richardson's proposals the other day improve the bill somewhat, but it remains to be seen whether the final version of the bill will be an improvement over the present system, bad as that is.

It may be said that the discussion of welfare, unlike the other institutions I have described, relates uniquely to the poor. It does not.

Who pays for welfare? One of the great sources of anger on the part of the industrial worker taking home $58 a week after taxes in New York is that his taxes are helping to give tax-free support of $64 a week to a welfare mother and her three children. True welfare reform—a negative income tax or a justly conceived family income supplement plan—would provide assistance to that angry industrial worker who needs and deserves it just as much, and would ultimately alleviate his sense that his tax dollars are not being spent for broad social purposes.

There are other institutions which fit into the pattern of failure—failure through being oversized, overbureaucratic, overly impersonal, and overly insensitive. There are the courts and residential institutions for children, which I have discussed earlier. There is the role of the university and of the church. There is the pervasive effect of racism, hostility to diversity, and callousness to powerlessness which cuts across the functioning of all of our institutions.

Perhaps, above all, the institution which is failing our children is Government. Government is the ultimate source of funds for programs. Government is a major source of regulations to make institutions respond to children's needs. But Government in this country has allowed itself to become enmeshed in one of the greatest situations of distorted priorities in the history of a democratic government.

Government in this country seems incapable of extricating itself from unpopular wars which still cost money and lives. Government seems incapable of stopping the flow of dollars into useless weaponry and high-flying elephants. And all the while children suffer and the institutions which are supposed to serve them are subjected to no searching inquiry, no serious push for reform. Yes, if we are looking at the institutions which have failed our children, let us look first and foremost at ourselves here in the U.S. Senate.

Recommendations. It is neither practicable nor feasible to set forth a total program for reform and change. The length of such program would be a book or a set of volumes in itself. Its total cost would be staggering. Among other things, those who would criticize this speech for political reasons—and there will be those—would have a field day with the supposed impracticality of it all.

But any program for reform must begin with a cry for recalculation of our national priorities. The refrain is familiar by now. I need not go through it again. But if the White House Conference is to contribute anything, that is where it should begin. For, apart from the immorality of spending money on unneeded weaponry while children go hungry, the sad fact is that in this great, affluent nation, we will never have enough resources to solve our problems unless we begin to exercise wisdom and good sense in the way in which we spend our national funds.

We need far more resources devoted to the solution of domestic problems. With proper priorities and a healthy, growing economy, I believe we could begin to do what has to be done.

The other day it was decided that it was more important to fully fund a $110 million authorization for a space station than it was to more adequately fund public housing. Every day we reenact another example of our present set of priorities, in which usually the child is the loser. He has lost over and over again during the past decade, and unless we can reorder priorities, he will continue to lose.

Had we the resources, the agenda is not difficult to see: It must include a guaranteed decent job for everyone; income maintenance for all; national health insurance; an adequate program of early childhood development; sufficient funds to extend service to all the handicapped children who need it; and so on down the list.

But what is needed is far more than just money. For, apart from the scarcity of funds, our institutions are simply not working very well.

It is not just that we cannot run a welfare system. We cannot get our hospitals to dispense decent, efficient medical care, either. It is not just that we cannot seem to get enough food to hungry children. Our schools cannot seem to interest or really educate our children either.

The question is not just one of a need for urgent attention to pressing problems. It is also one of philosophy and approach.

I have been for all the old programs. But even where we have spent a lot of money, things are often worse than they were before.

Because we did not listen. We bulldozed whole neighborhoods and called it urban renewal, over the anguished cries of those who told us it was Negro removal. We stacked people together in public housing and wondered what they were trying to tell us when they defaced walls and broke windows.

We built huge universities and wondered what the kids were talking about when they cried out about the impersonality of everything. We spent some Federal money—not nearly what was needed—on the public schools without asking how it was being spent or whether we were getting any results; then we acted suprised when citizens' groups told us that some of the money had been diverted to illegal purposes and was not helping poor children. We poured money into the welfare system without reform, long after recipients and welfare workers alike were telling us of its disastrous effects. The BIA did not listen to the cries of the Indians it was supposed to be helping, and now the first Americans are very nearly the last Americans.

It is time for us, as liberals, to face the fact that our approach has too often been self-satisfied, Washington-centered, insensitive, and conformist. We thought we knew best, and in so thinking, we robbed people of their pride and their sense of involvement in themselves and in their communities. Albeit unwittingly, we have often done as much damage as good.

In some ways the old political machines were more responsive than we are. At least people got some assistance in return for serving up their freedom. Now the bureaucrat whom they have to go to for help does not live in their neighborhood, does not speak their language, has no reason to deliver and often risks his career if he does.

Any nation which discovers in 1967 that it has 15 million hungry citizens in its midst cannot be very confident that it is doing things right. Any nation which discovers in 1970 that it has thousands of teachers in its schools who literally do not speak the same language as their students must doubt whether it is pursuing the right course.

If our national approach has been bulldozer solutions coupled with bureaucracy, this has been just as true of State government and local housing and redevelopment authorities and other agencies. Many have failed in the fundamental task of listening to and showing some understanding of those whom they are supposed to serve.

We need, first, a total reexamination of all of our institutions and programs in this country. What are we getting for our money? What are our children getting for our money? We are creaking along in 1970, trying to run a government and schools and social services through institutions which were created tens of decades and even centuries ago, and in many cases have not been reexamined since.

The changes in size alone are staggering. The United States Steel Corporation which the Government broke up under the antitrust laws more than half a century ago was smaller than the typical medium size corporation today. Before World War I, no university in the Western World had more than 5,000 students. Now 30,000 students is only a moderate-sized student body. Hospitals which had one employee for every three patients a half century ago now have three employees for every one patient. Some foundations have international operations and offices which are larger than most foreign governments.

The impersonality and unresponsiveness which comes along with

the size is understandable. I have discussed some of it in these remarks. So the answer to our problem is far more than just money, although we certainly need more money as well.

One key matter to focus on is size. All the evidence suggests that adults and children feel more involved and are served better by small institutions. We can get smaller institutions by breaking up bigger ones and by creating new, smaller ones.

We can emphasize the building of neighborhood health clinics instead of concentrating almost exclusively on hospitals—clinics to serve target populations of 30,000 instead of 300,000. We can make sure that our new college campuses are smaller in size and just build more of them. When we build new correctional facilities, we can insure that they are small enough to allow the kind of group interaction which benefits the children whom we put in them.

We can decrease the size of existing facilities. We can create colleges within colleges, campuses within campuses, no matter what the institution.

Above all, we can and must do something about the size of government. Many functions which are performed on the citywide level could be handled at the neighborhood level far more responsively and far more effectively. Much of what goes on in the Federal Government could be given over to the local government with strong Federal supervision and strong Federal standards. That is not the old liberal philosophy, but it is one which just might work better.

Attention to the size of institutions—reducing them to the smallest viable size—is one key element in making them work.

Another key element is regulation. Ralph Nader, with all that he has done, has reminded us that the regulatory agencies, which we created with such fanfare a generation ago and earlier, have more and more come to be just captives of those whom they are supposed to regulate. Regulations can help with the size of institutions. It is certainly not shocking to begin thinking of breaking up corporate units into smaller entities. That, after all, was done at the turn of the century, and regulation can help with the quality of life. Is it not shocking to think that, had we the will, Government regulation could result in the cleansing of the air and water? Nor do children's toys have to be dangerous.

So regulation is one key word which has been lost from our vocabulary to the great detriment of our children and all of us.

Another key word, related to regulation, is accountability. As the institutions and programs which I have discussed have grown and proliferated, they have become sovereignties unto themselves, accountable to no one, proceeding along from day to day without supervision or question from the outside. Some of the accountability can be built internally. Agencies can begin to evaluate their own programs and release those evaluations to the public.

Perhaps a more important aspect of accountability is using money as leverage—the demanding by the Federal Government of accountability on the part of those to whom it gives money.

For years the Federal Johnson-O'Malley and impacted areas money has flowed to local public schools for the education of Indian children with no questions asked. We could begin to demand the hiring of Indian teachers, parental and community involvement in schools, the

institution of bilingual programs, the institution of Indian history and cultural classes, and above all, a measure of dignity for the Indian child in return for the Federal flow of dollars.

We could begin to ask what local school districts are doing with the money under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act, and to demand results.

The disaster which masquerades for our health care system in this country could be turned around very quickly if the Government were to seriously get about the business of demanding performance for the billions of dollars it pours into the health care field. If the Government began to say that hospitals had to reorganize, that medical schools had to turn out students other than doctors as a condition of receiving Government research and other funds, if all of these things were done, the cost of health care would go down and quality would go up.

Accountability can also be stimulated from the outside, and here we come to another key word—advocacy. The Government never got serious about monitoring where its funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act had gone until a group on the outside did its own evaluation, and came up with the conclusion that Title I was not really helping poor children. Some would say HEW is not doing much better now, but at least it is aware of the problems, and if you go and talk to the auditors who work at HEW, they are jubilant. The outside advocates have put them on the map. They have more staff than they ever had. They are delighted that outside advocacy has come along and given them a job. They are delighted at the idea that someone wants their help, wants their contribution in keeping the Government honest. So outside advocacy has a great role to play in assuring accountability.

One of the most exciting developments in our society right now is the outside advocacy—both through the legal services program and through public interest law firms, as well as the young professionals in other fields who have taken it upon themselves to try to bring accountability to their professions. It is in this area that there is both great hope for change and great need for vigilance. For when these young professionals are successful, they get into political trouble—witness this week's Finance Committee vote to prohibit legal services lawyers from suing to challenge welfare policies.

A fifth key word—far more fundamental than advocacy, as important as that is—is participation: The sharing of power and the alleviation of powerlessness. One facet of the lack of accountability is that bureaucrats have come to believe that bureaucracy exists for their internal benefit. They forget their mandate, which is to see that services are delivered to the people.

No one really knows more about whether a program is working or not, and whether it is being properly administered than those whom it is supposed to benefit. More important, the only way to eliminate paternalism, laziness and unresponsiveness is to share power. If we do nothing else in the 1970s we must make it our goal to achieve participation programs by those who are supposed to benefit from them and by the community generally. Such participation, such sharing of power, should become a familiar aspect of our national life.

Fortunately, the political and other struggles of the past decade have given us some models for participation.

The Headstart program at its best has shown us what a marvelously rich experience parent involvement can be—both in terms of the parents coming to understand what quality education is and also in terms of the enhanced learning experience of a child. The extension of that kind of parent involvement throughout all preschool education, and indeed throughout the elementary and secondary schools as well, would be a great boon in our society.

It is critical that the method of participation that we adopt be one in which real power is shared. There is always the bureaucratic temptation to try to co-opt—to try and create nice-sounding advisory boards which have no power, are convened once or twice a year in a fancy board room or holet, and are then ignored. The struggle to create the proper mix for participation will not be easy. There is an appropriate role for professionals in both administration and policy, and citizen participation must include both those who are served by the program and representatives of the community generally.

Welfare need not be controlled by welfare recipients, but they must be represented in a real way in the making and application of policy. The university need not be turned over to the students and faculty, but they should be represented on the board of trustees. The doctors and the hospital administrators should still have something to say about the way a hospital is run, but the community should be directly represented on the board as well.

There is one aspect of participation which I want to emphasize particularly. That is the idea of having children themselves participate in the process of their institutions. I do not wish to overstate this concept—I am not suggesting that 5-year-olds need to sit on the boards of kindergartens; but high school students can participate very actively in decisionmaking in their institutions and in teaching younger students, as well.

Ghetto youths in St. Louis have done a fine job of running a rat control program. Youngsters would make the most effective nucleus of a preventive drug education program, because peer group testimony is what would be most influential. Instead of mistrusting one generation of young people to have any constructive influence on those just below them—which is what we seem to do now—I think it is crucially important that we involve young people in working with children.

Another key word is "innovation." We just have to be prepared to try new approaches. Whether schools without walls or magnet schools, or open classrooms or individualized instruction, or new forms of early childhood development, or new approaches to juvenile delinquency, the subject does not matter. The point is that the way we are doing things now is not working. We simply have to have new approaches.

Another important need is to find new ways of getting Federal money out to the communities for the benefit of children. The goal should be to encourage initiative at the local level while requiring adherence to strong national standards and requirements of accountability. Here I part most emphatically from those who would simply use revenue sharing or block grants as a means of handing out money to States and localities without any strings attached. But I also depart from some of my liberal brethren who are still enthralled with the categorical grant-in-aid approach that has a large Federal bureaucracy at the top handing out money to the States, which in turn give it

to localities. This has resulted in the worst kind of bureaucratic delay and diffusion of purpose. We simply have to find new ways of getting the money directly to communities and even to neighborhoods for broad social purposes—but without giving up the idea of strong Federal standards.

The concept of national standards is extremely important. We are quite familiar with the patchwork of programs which passes for a welfare system, and the patchwork of local fiefdoms which passes for health care systems. It is time we set national standards for performance as a country and stuck to them, through the processes of regulation and accountability which I have already described.

Another key idea is rights—legal rights. This has two aspects. First, for too long we have regarded various social programs and services as a matter of largesse dispensed by the State. It is time we began to think in terms of creating legally enforceable obligations for our children, on which they can sue if the obligation goes unfulfilled either in dollar terms or, for that matter, in quality. If we are ever to have any kind of national standard which really works to deliver service to people, we are going to have to create legally enforceable rights to go with it. This will be a massive job, and will require careful study, but I believe it is a major matter on the agenda.

The second aspect of the idea of legal rights has to do with rights of children vis-a-vis institutions—rights of children in school to engage in free expression and not to be subjected to discipline without due process, rights of children in court not to be subject to being disposed of without adequate counsel or real rules of law. The development of a body of children's law is also an important matter on the agenda.

A final key word is options, protected by national standards. A child and his family should have a full range of options as to where they want to live. The child should have a choice of educational experiences, a full choice of possible life-styles and professions. We shut off the choices both ways sometimes. We do not integrate the schools and we deny ghetto schools the power and the funds they need to improve. We keep the suburbs lily-white as a practical matter and we keep the ghetto a slum. We make life for the Indian an impossibility both on the reservation and in the city. "Options" is a very important word.

I call now for a national reexamination of all of our institutions by reference to these 10 criteria—size, regulation, accountability, advocacy, participation, innovation, new avenues of money flow, national standards, legal rights, and options.

Let us see how some of these ideas might work in relation to a matter of which I have not discussed in any detail, a timely subject on which public debate is going on—the question of day care, or more properly, early childhood development programs.

For various reasons, it appears that a good deal of new Federal money is about to be poured into the early childhood development field. I favor putting more money into this area. But let us be sure we do not make the same old mistakes all over again.

Some say that the present Federal day-care guidelines are too stringent, that, if they are kept as they are, no project will be able to get started. No doubt there are ways in which these guidelines can be improved, but there is in my judgment one nonnegotiable criterion for whether an early childhood development program is an acceptable

recipient of Federal money; not whether it enables the mother to work, but whether the program enhances the child's development. There is no point in pouring Federal money into a program that amounts to the warehousing of children, to a federally subsidized baby-sitting service. If we are going to provide money for early childhood development, let us do it correctly.

This means community participation in the planning and administration of the program; it means appropriate professional participation in the teaching or care at the program; and it means health care and nutritional value in the program.

There are those whose express interest in day care is to make it possible for mothers to work. They are applying growing pressure to provide 5-day-a-week, 10-hour-a-day child care for preschool children whose mothers work, or would work if these services were available. In some cases, this would be an improvement. There are thousands of young children—latchkey children—who are left at home to care for themselves, or are looked after by brothers or sisters barely older than they are. Unquestionably, a program with adult supervision and hot meals would be an improvement for them. But the creation of institutions with warm rooms, several adults, and breakfast, lunch, and dinner does not necessarily add up to child development.

I wonder whether many preschoolers—especially the very young—would not be served better by programs lasting several hours, rather than all day, or by programs that send tutors into their homes to work with them and their mothers. I know of one program here in the District that sent tutors to the homes of ghetto youngsters aged 1½ to 3 years, several hours a week, and was extremely successful in preventing IQ declines of 15 to 20 points that other ghetto youngsters were experiencing. That was not a day-care program. It did not make it possible for the mothers to work. But it was a tremendously impressive child development. And that is what the criterion should be.

There is also a question about the funding channels for these new programs. I see that some of my colleagues are proposing day-care programs which go exclusively through the States. I think it is time we learned that money sent out from the Federal Government by way of the States, through the State bureaucracy, to the localities gets to be pretty thin by the time it reaches the end of the pipeline. It is terribly important that we make money available directly to community groups and directly to local governments. Otherwise, the kind of early childhood development program we want will simply not be forthcoming. It is equally important for us to make sure that any private enterprise involvement in the provision of day care is subject not only to very careful standards, but to full community participation in the planning of the administration of whatever centers a franchise operation or a corporation becomes involved in.

The essential point here is that it will not do, in 1970, to simply write a blank check—pour a whole lot of money into something, anything, called "day care", and then forget about the matter. We must do more than spend the money. After we authorize and appropriate the money, we must engage in appropriate oversight proceedings to see that the money is properly spent. We have gone on for too long just pouring out what little money we do appropriate without finding out where and how and to what end it is spent.

What I have been saying today comes down to a few simple sentences. We have to place a higher priority on our children and their families than we do on expensive military gadgetry or expensive space extravaganzas. We desperately need to instill some understanding, humaneness, and sensitivity into the existing institutions which are supposed to serve our children. We neew to instill an attitude of respect for a child's heritage, for his family, for his language, and for his individuality, and his potential. We need to involve children themselves and their parents in a significant decisionmaking role in these institutions. We need to recognize that we can and must provide far greater life chances for our children than we do now. Our children are our chance for change. They are our bridge to a better world. They are our only hope. Let us begin to act like we understand this.

If that recognition, coupled with a sense of urgency and a concrete implementation mechanism, can emerge from the forthcoming White House Conference, I will count the conference a success.

Over the past nearly 6 years, I have probably served on as many human-problem committees and subcommittees as any of my colleagues. I have been all over this country—its ghettos, its Indian reservations, migrant labor camps, among the Eskimos and the Athabascans, and in the pockets of white poverty—and I am unable to express the profound frustration that I feel at knowing that we are such a powerful and wealthy society and at the same time seem to so tragically fail thousands and millions of our children. It is not only immoral. It is not only unnecessary. I think this failure tampers with the very existence and future of a vital democratic society.

If in our generation we could shift these priorities and make these institutional changes and, above all, commit ourselves to a full and effective reordering of society, so that every child had a chance—a full and a fair chance, which is what I understand to be the promise of America—I think our generation will have done more than any other to strengthen and revitalize our society and to assure a bright and a secure future.

EXHIBIT 1

THE CHILDREN'S CHARTER

President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, recognizing the rights of the child as the first rights of citizenship, pledges itself to these aims for the Children of America.

I. For every child spiritual and moral training to help him to stand firm under the pressure of life.

II. For every child understanding and the guarding of his personality as his most precious right.

III. For every child a home and that love and security which a home provides; and for the child who must receive foster care, the nearest substitute for his own home.

IV. For every child full preparation for his birth; his mother receiving prenatal, and postnatal care; and the establishment of such protective measures as will make childbearing safer.

V. For every child health protection from birth through adolescence, including: periodical examinations and, where needed, care of specialists and hospital treatment. . . .

VI. For every child from birth through adolescence, promotion of health, including health instruction and a health program, wholesome physical and mental recreation, with teachers and leaders adequately trained.

VII. For every child a dwelling place safe, sanitary, and wholesome, with reasonable provisions for privacy, free from conditions which tend to thwart his development; and a home environment harmonious and enriching.

VIII. For every child a school which is safe from hazards, sanitary, properly equipped, lighted, and ventilated. For younger children nursery schools and kindergartens to supplement home care.

IX. For every child a community which recognizes and plans for his needs, protects him against physical dangers, moral hazards, and disease . . . and makes provision for his cultural and social needs.

X. For every child an education which, through the discovery and development of his individual abilities, prepares him for life; and through training and vocational guidannce prepares him for a living which will yield him the maximum of satisfaction.

XI. For every child such teaching and training as will prepare him for successful parenthood, homemaking, and the rights of citizenship; and, for parents, supplementary training to fit them to deal wisely with the problems of parenthood.

XII. For every child education for safety and protection against accidents to which modern conditions subject him . . .

XIII. For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early dicover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability. . . .

XIV. For every child who is in conflict with society the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast. . . .

XV. For every child the right to grow up in a family with an adequate standard of living and the security of a stable income as the surest safeguard against social handicaps.

XVI. For every child protection against labor that stunts growth, either physical or mental that limits education, that deprives children of the rights of comradeship, of play, and of joy.

XVII. For every rural child as satisfactory schooling and health services as for the city child, and an extension . . . of social, recreational, and cultural facilities.

XVIII. To supplement the home and the schools in the training of youth . . . every stimulation and encouragement should be given to the extension and development of the voluntary youth organizations.

XIX. To make everywhere available these minimum protections of the health and welfare of children, there should be a district, county, or community organization for health, education, and welfare. . . .

For every child these rights, regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live under the protection of the American flag.

○